



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

1
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/965,697	09/27/2001	Tarlochan Singh Dhadialla	A9526	4412
60394	7590	08/09/2007	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE WASHINGTON, DC 20037			BRANNOCK, MICHAEL T	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1649		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		08/09/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/965,697	DHADIALLA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael Brannock	1649

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 December 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-10, 14 and 15 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-10, 14 and 15 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 27 September 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Application: Claims and Amendments

Applicant is notified that the amendments put forth on 12/19/2006, have been entered in full.

Applicant is notified that the finality of the prior Office action has been withdrawn in view of the new issue below.

Response to Amendment

Applicant is notified that any outstanding objection or rejection that is not expressly maintained in this Office action has been withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-10, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claims are directed to a genus of an essentially unlimited scope of multiple gene regulation systems utilizing steroid receptors. Each system requires that at least two expression schemes operate "orthogonally" i.e. that operation of one does not influence or effect the operation of any other. The specification describes two examples of such, i.e. a Lepidopteran/Dipteran and a Lepidopteran/Homopteran ecdysone receptor scheme, which

apparently rely on the fact that the Dipteran and Homopteran components do not interact with the Lepidopteran components. Furthermore, the claims are not limited to systems with only two expression schemes as described above, but are directed to multiple system, i.e. having more than two, none of which have been described in the specification. The skilled artisan would not recognize that applicant was in possession of a genus having multiple expression systems. One would need develop multiple ligands (e.g. more than 2) and nuclear steroid receptors that act independently of each other. The specification does not describe such. The specification essentially admits that these components would have to be discovered. Pages 40-43 outline art recognized ways for *searching* for specific ligands and mutant receptors, but it is obvious that Applicant's were not in possession of such.

To determine whether there is correspondence between the generic invention of the claims and the written description, is necessary to determine whether the description conveys to one skilled in the relevant art that applicant was in possession of the claimed genus at the time the application was filed. To this end, it is appropriate to inquire whether a number of species representative of the genus are described in complete structural terms or, alternatively, with reference to other identifying characteristics, *e.g.*, partial structure, chemical properties, functional properties, *etc.* What constitutes a "representative number" of species for any given genus depends in part on whether the level of skill in the art, the teachings in the disclosure, or teachings in the prior art establish predictability as to the structural properties characteristic of the genus. In the instant case, applicant has not pointed to any chemical structure that will provide the required specificity and uniqueness of binding between the ligand and the receptor for use in the claimed multiple orthogonal systems. Rather, the structures provided on page 40

are of those natural ecdysteroids that are quite cross-reactive across insect species. This property of the structures is contrary to that required of the claimed invention. Furthermore, Possession may not be shown by merely describing how to obtain possession of members of the claimed genus or how to identify their common structural features. See *University of Rochester*, 38 F.3d at 927, 69 USPQd at 1895. Without a correlation between structure and function the claim does little more than define the claimed invention by function. That is not sufficient to define a genus because it is only an indication of what the gene or ligand does, rather than what it is, see, *Eli Lilly*, 119 F.3d at 1568, 43 USPQ2d at 1406.

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19USPQ2d 1111, clearly states that “applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession *of the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the ‘written description’ inquiry, *whatever is now claimed.*” (See page 1117.) The specification does not “clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed.” (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116).

With the exception of the Lepidopteran/Dipteran and Lepidopteran/Homopteran ecdisone receptor schemes referred to above, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure and amino acid sequences of the encompassed multiple gene regulation systems, and therefore conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method of isolating it. The nucleic acid itself is required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25

USPQ2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18

USPQ2d 1016.

One cannot describe what one has not conceived. See *Fiddes v. Baird*, 30 USPQ2d 1481 at 1483. In *Fiddes*, claims directed to mammalian FGF's were found to be unpatentable due to lack of written description for that broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence.

Therefore, only the Lepidopteran/Dipteran and a Lepidopteran/Homopteran ecdysone receptor scheme, but not the full breadth of the claim meets the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Applicant is reminded that *Vas-Cath* makes clear that the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. §112 is severable from its enablement provision (see page 1115).

Conclusion

No claims are allowable.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Brannock, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0869. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Fridays from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan, can be reached at (571) 272-0841. Official papers filed by fax should be directed to **571-273-8300**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

MB

WY

August 5, 2007



LORRAINE SPECTOR
PRIMARY EXAMINER